

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 26, 2003 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

In the Office Action, claims 5, 6, and 13-16 are withdrawn by the Examiner as being directed to a non-elected Species C (Figs. 6A and 6B). In addition, the Examiner rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,586,789 to Kishimoto et al. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto in view of Applicant's Related Art (hereinafter "ARA").

The Examiner alleges that claims 5 and 6 as amended in the Amendment of August 7, 2003 are directed to a non-elected Species C (Fig. 6). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claims 5 and 6 require that "the width of the electrode pad increases with its length." Figs. 9A-9B and the supporting disclosure at paragraphs 52 and 53 of the specification relate the width of the electrode pad and its length. Therefore, claims 5 and 6 as they were amended are directed to Species A (which includes Figs. 9A and 9B), not Species C as alleged by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that Claims 5 and 6 be reinstated, considered on the merits, and allowed.

Furthermore, Claims 13-15 are also directed to Species A as illustrated in Fig. 9A-9B. Claim 13 requires "the electrode links differ from each other in a thickness", which is illustrated in Fig. 9A and, 9B and described in the specification at paragraph 55. As illustrated, the electrode links in 9A and 9B are different in their thickness.

At least for those reasons, Applicant submits that claims 5, 6, and 13-15, as amended, are still directed to the elected Species A. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that claims 5, 6, and 13-15 be reinstated and allowed.

With regard to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kishimoto and the rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kishimoto in view of ARA, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Kishimoto considered separately or in combination with ARA does not teach, disclose, or suggest all the features of Applicant's invention as required by claim 1.

Kishimoto relates to the pitch, or distance, between terminals 13 and 14 (col. 2, line 14-39). It does not discuss at all the size of the pad members themselves or the length of the electrode links. Furthermore, Kishimoto does not disclose or suggest "each of the pad members having a different size in accordance with the length of the electrode link."

The Examiner alleges that pad number 13 is longer than pad number 14 (Office Action of August 26, 2003, page 6, paragraph 1), however, there is nothing in the disclosure of Kishimoto to support this. The Examiner appears to be relying solely on the shape of the terminals 13 and 14 as they are illustrated in Fig. 4. However, it is understood that the drawing figures are merely illustrative of what is discussed in the specification, and that Fig. 4 is not drawn to scale. As noted above, nothing in the supporting specification refers to the length of the pad members themselves.

Furthermore, Fig. 4 does not suggest that the "pad member having a different size *in accordance with* the length of the electrode link" (emphasis added).

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: November 26, 2003

Respectfully submitted,


By _____
Rebecca Goldman Rudich
Registration No.: 41,786
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant

